

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Gary CRANCE
Serial No. : 09/688,142
Filed : October 16, 2000
Title : ONLINE IMAGE PROTECTION

Art Unit : 2132
Examiner : Jung W. Kim
Conf. No. : 9995

MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO ACTION OF JULY 26, 2006

OK to enter
In reply to the Final Office Action of July 26, 2006, applicant submits the following remarks.

Claims 1-9, 11-31, 33-50, and 52-88 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 23, 42, 52, and 64 being independent.

35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph Rejection

Claims 76, 78, 80, 82, and 84 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because these claims comply with the enablement requirement, as discussed below.

Each of these claims recite replacing the indicator with the content such that the indicator and the content are presented as alternatives. The Examiner argues that this language is in contradiction to the language of the independent claims from which these claims depend, that is, that perception of the content is prevented at the indicator whenever the user attempts to capture the content. The Examiner states that "the content and the indicator are [sic] present as defined in the parent claims, whereas the content and the indicator are alternatives in the dependent claims." Applicant first points out that the independent claims do not actually recite that the content and the indicator are present. The independent claims merely require that the perception of content is prevented at the indicator whenever the user attempts to capture the content. Contrary to the Examiner's assumption, the language "at the indicator" does not require nor recite the presence of the indicator at the moment that the content is present. For this reason, the